

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

|                                     | 5.5.            |                      |                         |                  |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.                     | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 09/734,882                          | 12/13/2000      | Amit J. Patel        | . 0026-0010             | 5682             |
| 26615                               | 7590 01/23/2004 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP               |                 |                      | MIZRAHI, DIANE D        |                  |
| 11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD<br>SUITE 300 |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| FAIRFAX, V                          | A 22030         |                      | 2175                    | #11              |
|                                     |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004 | 4                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   | 09/734,882   | PATEL ET AL  |   |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |   |
|   | DIANE D. MIZRAHI   | 2175   |   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a P riod for Reply   | appears on the cover she   | et with the correspondence   | address   |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, m reply within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) tute, cause the application to become  | ay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered tin MONTHS from the mailing date of thi me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).                                |   |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u>  | <i>July 2003</i> .   |  |   |
| 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th  | nis action is non-final.   |  |   |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde   |  |  | the merits is                                       |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |  |   |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application  | on.  |  |   |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd  | rawn from consideration  |  |   |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |  | _   |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.   |  |  |   |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  | DIANE D. AU  |   |
| <ul><li>8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and</li><li>Application Papers</li></ul>   | d/or election requirement  | PRIMARY PATEN<br>TECHNOLOGY CI   | HI<br>IT EXAMINE!<br>ENTER 2100                     |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Exami  | ner  | U  |   |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 December 2000</u> is   |  | b) objected to by the Exa  | aminer.   |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the   | ·  |  |   |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre  |  |  |   |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the   | Examiner. Note the attac   | ched Office Action or form   | PTO-152.  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120   |  |  |   |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume 3. Acknowledgment from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language priority acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome reference was included in the first sentence of        | ents have been received. ents have been received. ents have been received riority documents have beau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). st of the certified copies stic priority under 35 U.S first sentence of the spec provisional application ha stic priority under 35 U.S | in Application No een received in this Nation not received. S.C. § 119(e) (to a provision cification or in an Application as been received. S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since | nal application)<br>on Data Sheet.<br>ce a specific |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   |  | iew Summary (PTO-413) Paper N  |   |
| <ul> <li>2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s</li> </ul>  |  | e of Informal Patent Application (P  | PTO-152)  |

Application/Control Number: 09/734,882 Page 2

Art Unit: 2175

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 are presented for examination.

The amendment of July 7, 2003 has been entered and has been used to reject Claims 1-12 below.

Regarding the Advisory Action dated 10-21-03, and in response to Applicants remarks, all previous presented rejections of the claims are hereby withdrawn as to being moot.

Claims 1-12 are pending with this new Non-final Office Action in view of the new grounds of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC§ 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title; if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not he negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 03(a) as being unpatentable over Aalbersberg (U.S. Patent # 5,946,678) in view of Stern et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,397,218).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 1 and 7, Aalbersberg discloses a method and a system to be performed by a client device for highlighting search terms in documents distributed over a network (see fig. 6, External Document base and see column 6 lines 48-55), comprising: generating a search query including a search term (see column 7, lines 17-58); receiving a list of one or more links distributed over the network I response to the search query (see column 7, lines 61-67 and see Fig. 4, search window); retrieving a web document corresponding to the selected from the network(see column 8, lines 17-20, the selected document is displayed in the viewer window 62); highlighting one or more occurrences of the search term in the list of one or more references (see column 8 lines 21-25); receiving selection of one of the references (see column 8, lines 17-20).

Aalbersberg does not teach links to web documents distributed over a network, receiving selection of one of the links and intercepting the web document.

Stern et al. teaches links to web documents distributed over a network, receiving selection of one of the links (see figure 1) and (see column 2 lines 7-18 and lines 42-46, all pages meeting criteria are returned as successful objects of the search) and intercepting the web documents (col 2, lines 35-46).

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg with the teachings of Stern et al. to include links to web documents distributed over a network, receiving selection of one of the links and intercepting the web documents the motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

As to claim 2, Aalbersberg as modified discloses wherein the highlighting includes: automatically searching the retrieved document to locate each occurrence of the search term (see fig. S, highlighting of each occurrence of the word implies automatic iterative search), and for each occurrence of the search term, changing a characteristic of the search term in the document (see column 6 lines I I-13).

Aalbersberg as modified does not teach in the intercepted web documents.

Stern et al. teaches in the intercepted web documents (see column 2 lines 35-62).

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg as modified by the teachings of Stern et al. to include in the intercepted web documents with the motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

As to claim 3, Aalbersberg as modified discloses wherein the changing includes: changing at least one of a color, font, style, effect, and size of the search term in the retrieved document (see column 6 lines 1 I-13, effect reads on lightly shaded background, see fig. 5).

Aalbersberg as modified does not teach in the intercepted web documents (see column 2 lines 35-62).

Stern et al. teaches in the intercepted web documents (see column 2 lines 35-52).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg as modified by the teachings of Stern et al. to include in the intercepted web documents with the

motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

As to claim 4, Aalbersberg as modified discloses providing the document with the highlighted search term to a user (see column 8 lines 21-25, see fig. 5 the viewer window 52).

Aalbersberg as modified does not teach in the intercepted web documents.

Stern et al. teaches in the intercepted web documents (see column 2 lines 35-62).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg as modified by the teachings of Stern et al, to include in the intercepted web documents with the motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 6, Aalbersberg as modified discloses wherein the generating includes: sending the search query to one of a search engine (see column 6 lines 48-55 and fig. 6, FTR).

Aalbersberg as modified does not teach a web directory to obtain the list of one or more links.

Stern et al. teaches a web directory to obtain the list of one or more links (see figure 1), (see column I lines 57-67 and see column 2 lines 42-46, all pages meeting criteria are returned as successful objects of the search).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg as modified by the teachings of Stern et al. to include a web directory to obtain the list of one or more links with the motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

As to claim 8, Aalbersberg as modified discloses a client device that highlights search terms in documents remotely distributed over a network (see column 6 lines 48-55) to aid in the determination of relevance of the documents (see abstract,

Art Unit: 2175

lines I l -17), comprising: a memory configured to store instructions (see Fig 1, Memory 13); and a processor configured to execute the instructions in the memory to receive a search query that includes a search term (see Fig 1, CPU 12 and Fig. 6, FTR Engine 60), to documents distributed over the network (see column 7, lines 61-67 and Fig. 6 External Document base 61) using the search query, retrieve a document corresponding to the selected reference (see fig. 5, viewer window 52), and highlight the search term in the retrieved document (see column 8 lines 21-25).

Aalbersberg does not teach obtain a list of one or more links, download a web document corresponding to the selected link form the network, and intercept the web document.

Stern et al. teaches obtain a list of one or more links (Figure 1), download a web document corresponding to the selected link form the network, (column 2, lines 35-52) and intercept the web document (Figure 1); see also column 2 lines 7-18 and lines 42-46, all pages meeting criteria are returned as successful objects of the search).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. to include obtain a list of one or more links, download a web document

Art Unit: 2175

corresponding to the selected link form the network, and intercept the web document with the motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

As to claim 9, Aalbersberg discloses a browser assistant that interacts with a browser on a client device (see Fig. 6, FTR Engine 60 and Fig. 7), comprising:

instructions for generating a search query including a search term (see column 7, lines 17-58);

and instructions for highlighting the search term in the retrieved document (see column 8 lines 21-25).

Aalbersberg does not teach instructions for obtain a list of one or more links, a web document corresponding to the selected link form the network, and intercept the web document.

Stern et al. teaches obtain a list of one or more links (Figure 1), download a web document corresponding to the selected link form the network, (column 2, lines 35-52) and intercept the web document (Figure 1); see also column 2 lines 7-18 and lines 42-46, all pages meeting criteria are returned as successful objects of the search).

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aalbersberg by the teachings of Stern et al. to include instructions for obtain a list of one or more links, web document corresponding to the selected link form the network, and intercept the web document with the motivation to provide for many Web domains have other links buried within their pages, and restricting a search to a specific Web domain results in ignoring information contained in these links and thereby allowing the user a great deal of flexibility in how a search is conducted (Stern et al. column 5, lines 30-33).

As to Claims 10-12 are computer-readable claims which contain the limitations which are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. Therefore, Claims 10-12 are rejected as set forth above.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane D. Mizrahi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (703) 305-3806. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

are (703) 305-9000 for regular communications and (703) 305-9000 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9001.

Man**e/** Mizrahi

Primary Patent Examiner Technology Center 2100

January 20, 2004